

Vermont.
We find the following commentary in the *Republic* on the recent conduct of the model Whig state of the North—the North star—the star that never sets. We are getting a good many illustrations of the assertion that the Abolitionists of the North are few in number, and contemptible in influence.

This movement of a State has thrown the small residuum of compromisers that remain since the late elections into great trouble. The pretensions they put forth of their own numerical force and of the great popularity of their scheme in the country are undergoing a rapid and fatal collapse.

Vermont Nullification.
The Legislature of Vermont has disgraced itself by the passage of a law which we publish with great reluctance. We had understood that the members of this body had become measurably sane upon the slavery question; and had arrived at the conclusion that the Southern States might as well be suffered to take care of their own domestic interests without molestation or interference. We had understood that it was their intention to dispend with the "annual firebrand" which they had been in the habit of throwing into the halls of Congress; and that the session would pass off without any negro demonstration. But in this we have been mistaken. Instead of the usual offensive resolutions of the session, Vermont has passed an obviously unconstitutional law. She has committed an act of nullification.

What makes this movement of Vermont inexpressibly offensive, is the fact that there is not the most remote probability that the law will ever be acted upon. We presume that there are no fugitive slaves in the State. She has manifested a rebellious and revolutionary spirit merely for the sake of manifesting it. The law seems to have been passed solely for the purpose of mischief, to the end of doing something that might furnish just cause of offence, without the chance of answering any useful object.

We do not know that the legislature of Vermont were aware that they were engaged in an attempt at nullification.

It is charitable to suppose that they were merely ignorant of their rights and duties. But the Governor, who signed the bill, had no such excuse. Governor WILLIAMS has been the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the State. It is to be presumed that he has some acquaintance with the Constitution of the United States; and he has degraded himself and his position by assenting to the passage of a law which we know to be in direct violation of that sacred instrument. Governor WILLIAMS has been the candidate of the abolition party for the post he now occupies; and it is evident enough that he never ought to have been the candidate of any other party. From men of this character, both Whigs and Democrats at the North should cut themselves loose.

It may as well be said in plain language. An unprincipled and profligate coquetry with political abolition has disgraced both the great parties in the Northern States. It has been with them a cool and calculating game for power, reckless of all the social and civil ties which unite this great fraternity of Commonwealths. The time has come when this infamous system must be arrested, and when the good people of the North will unite to put down the miserable agitation which has so long harassed and vexed the country.

We understand that this act of the legislature of Vermont came with surprise upon her entire congressional delegation, and it would be gross injustice to them to imagine that they could and would assent to a law which so directly nullifies the Constitution and laws of the United States.

Even the frigid apathy of the *Intelligencer* is disturbed—and the ears which sometime ago could hear no discordant voice in the country, now recognize blasts from the North, and blasts from the South.

It is amusing to look at the explanations given by these national organs. The *Republic* ascribes the conduct of Vermont first to insanity, and then, growing more charitable, to ignorance. The *Intelligencer* thinks it must be inadvertence.

The *Republic* finally admits that "an unprincipled and profligate coquetry with political abolition, has disgraced both the great parties in the Northern States." Well, we suppose that also the Southern ultras from any further obligation to co-operate with either.

But what is to be done? Shall the South content herself with the sympathy and protests of the National organs? or shall she look for counsel any longer to a pair of advisers who now acknowledge that she has been betrayed into a compromise, and swindled out of the pitiful share of the benefits assigned her? Are not these the oracles that proclaimed the Wilcox Provision to be dead, and abolition put down?

BLASTS FROM THE NORTH AND BLASTS FROM THE SOUTH.—We are indebted to the *Springfield (Mass.) Republican* for the first knowledge of the passage of any such act by any State legislature as that which it describes:

"FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW IN VERMONT.—The legislature of Vermont, at its late session, passed a law with special reference to giving those 'inhabitants' of that State, arrested as fugitive slaves, the benefit of every person arrested, and of every possible legal defence. It devolves upon the circuit judges of the several judicial courts the power of issuing this writ, heretofore vested in the judges of the supreme court of the State, and make it the duty of the State several counties to apply to either class of judges or courts, in case the arrest of any inhabitant as a fugitive slave occurs, when the judge or court applied to shall issue the writ of *habeas corpus* and release him, or, if under any other writ in session, or to any judge of either court during vacation. If, under this writ, issued during the vacation by any judge, the person arrested and imprisoned as a fugitive, be not discharged, he is entitled to an appeal to the next term of the county court by furnishing proper bail. The court to which an appeal is made, or to which the writ was originally made returnable, as directed, upon the application of either party interested, to allow a trial by jury of all the facts at issue between the parties. The law makes it the special duty of the State's attorneys in the several counties to use every lawful means to procure the acquittal of every person arrested and committed to their districts as a fugitive slave, and instructed all judicial and executive officers, who shall know or have reason to believe that such an arrest is intended, to give immediate notice thereof to the attorney in their county, that he may immediately take the measures that devolve upon him for securing the rights of the arrested party."

We have never been more surprised than at this recent blast of abolition from that most respectable and heretofore always Whig State, Vermont. We were mortified and astonished that such an enactment should not only not only receive the concurrence of the legislature, but the sanction of the Governor. We noticed his message at the opening of the session of the State legislature, which they thought respectable and unexceptionable. Governor WILLIAMS, who consented to the law, has been many years a Judge, and, as we have understood, an eminent Judge; and he would not have been so ready to sanction such a law otherwise than as an directly repugnant to the Constitution and laws of the United States. This act of Vermont plainly and intentionally overrules and sets aside the Constitution and law of Congress. We hold it to be our duty, as persons attached to the preservation of the Constitution and Gov-

ernment, to protest against such unlawful State action, come from what quarter it may. Our surprise would have been less, and so would have been our mortification and indignation, had this enactment proceeded from a confessed abolition or "free-soil" source. We hear it said that this law passed almost unopposed through the forms of legislation; and this idea goes some support from the known fact that there has been no manifestation of discontent, no exciting agitation in Vermont on the subject of the Fugitive slave law. But this apology, if true, is a very poor and lame one. Measures of such importance as this, which would so directly and so palpably nullify the Constitution and laws of the United States, would not have been passed without the most serious and deliberate consideration. The members of the legislature would not have been so ready to sanction such a law otherwise than as an directly repugnant to the Constitution and laws of the United States. This act of Vermont plainly and intentionally overrules and sets aside the Constitution and law of Congress. We hold it to be our duty, as persons attached to the preservation of the Constitution and Gov-

For the Southern Press.
New York, 4th Dec. 1850.
I resume the subject of the condition of the English peasantry and operatives, as delineated by the writer quoted in my former letter.
"Last year a mass of evidence was laid before Parliament touching the condition of children employed in factories, which describes a system of torture compared with which the treatment of American slaves appears truly benevolent. When this evidence was published, the whole press of England repeated, day after day, that the worst kind of slavery exists in England. Children of tender years, (babies they would be called in America,) it was shown, are shut up in factories during twelve, fourteen, and sixteen hours every week day, and there compelled to work incessantly, or as hard at least as their slight frames will permit, and for wages which but just satisfy their ruined appetites. The pale cheek, parched lips, swollen stomachs, deformed limbs, and melancholy looks of these little wretches, will be easily imagined. They die off with amazing rapidity; but the places of those who perish are instantly filled, and a frequent change of persons makes no alteration in the scene. Verily, the life of the bulk of the people of England is worse than death."—Page 46.

In the slave States of America, a strong healthy boy or girl is worth £50. In London, on the contrary, of Poor Houses, or roads, or 'strong healthy boys and girls with the usual fee,' not for the usual fee. You do not pay the fee to obtain the boy or girl, but the parish officers pay you for taking one. The usual fee in London is £10, so that in America you pay five times as much as you receive in England. To be sure the boy and girl in London are stronger and healthier; the notice of the London House gives that they are both to invite customers, just as the keepers of gin shops place their windows with 'mountain dew,' and 'cream of the valley.'

"Ah! but," says a respectable Englishman, "the young Americans who cost £50, are born in slavery; the others are free-born English children. The buyer of an American child can do what he likes with it; the English child is merely bound apprentice for a term of years, and the parish pays with each of them an apprentice fee, as a recompense to the master for teaching him his trade. The magistrate is a party to the indentures of apprenticeship; he requires the child's consent; he cancels the bond if the child is ill treated. English children are protected by our glorious and inviolable laws, which makes no difference between rich and poor. It is absurd to compare apprentices with American slaves." I answer, it is the whole press of England, not I, that calls English children white slaves. But not to dispute about words, let us come to facts.

"About three years ago, a woman called Esther Hibner, was hanged in London for beating and starving to death a parish apprentice. In this case, the constitution and law were violated in behalf of the pauper girl—but when? Not before the pauper girl was murdered, but after. Does the law interfere to prevent the murder of apprentices?—this is the question. The evidence in the case of Esther Hibner proved that a number of girls (pauper apprentices) were employed in a workshop; that their virtuous conduct was commonly called 'her wash,' and that of this they never had enough to ward off the pains of hunger; that they were kept half-naked, half clothed in dirty rags; that they slept in a heap on the floor, amid filth and stench; that they suffered dreadfully from cold; that they were forced to work some hours together that they used to fall asleep while at work; that for falling asleep, or for not working as hard as their mistress wished, they were beaten with fists and with sticks, dragged by the hair, dashed to the ground, trampled upon, and otherwise tortured; that they were all found more or less, covered with chilblains, scurvy, bruises, and wounds; that one of them died of ill treatment; and—mark this—that the disciplinary power of the law was made use of to increase the number of codins which had issued from Esther Hibner's premises, and raised the curiosity of her neighbors. For this murder, Esther Hibner was hanged; but what did she get for all the other murders which, referring to the number of codins, we have a right to believe she committed? She got for each £10. That is to say, she was paid for every girl she murdered, dashed, and trampled to death, she got £10 for another girl to treat in the same way, with £10 for her trouble. She carried on a trade in the murder of parish apprentices; and if she had conducted it with moderation, if the profit and custom of murder had not made her grasping and careless, the constitution which protects the weak as well as the rich, would never have interfered with her. The law did not permit her to do what she liked with her apprentices, as the Americans do with their slaves—oh no! These free born English children were merely bound as apprentices, with their own consent, under the eye of a magistrate, in order that they might learn a trade, and become valuable subjects. But did the magistrate, even visit Mr. Hibner's factory, to see how she treated the free born English girls? Never. Did the parish officers? No. Was there any legal provision for the discovery of a woman's trade in murder? None. That woman has not traded in murder for the last three years; but why not? She was hanged three years ago. But what happened here? This is the constitution, or the number of codins? Plainly the number of codins; that is, the impunity, the security, with which she had murdered, the forlorn state of her apprentices, the utter neglect of them by parish officers and magistrates.

"Since Mrs. Hibner was hanged, the inimitable constitution has been altered, but not with respect to the parish apprentices. The 'rules of London poor houses,' 'strong healthy boys and girls, &c.' and boys and girls you may obtain by applying within, as many as you please, all free-born, with the usual fee. Having been paid for taking them, and having gone through the ceremonies of asking their consent, and signing bonds before a magistrate, they are now as the rich, would never have interfered with her. The law did not permit her to do what she liked with her apprentices, as the Americans do with their slaves—oh no! These free born English children were merely bound as apprentices, with their own consent, under the eye of a magistrate, in order that they might learn a trade, and become valuable subjects. But did the magistrate, even visit Mr. Hibner's factory, to see how she treated the free born English girls? Never. Did the parish officers? No. Was there any legal provision for the discovery of a woman's trade in murder? None. That woman has not traded in murder for the last three years; but why not? She was hanged three years ago. But what happened here? This is the constitution, or the number of codins? Plainly the number of codins; that is, the impunity, the security, with which she had murdered, the forlorn state of her apprentices, the utter neglect of them by parish officers and magistrates.

"This commentary on the quotation is trite—second-hand even as applied to us. We thought we could quote a sentiment of fortitude from the speech Milton ascribes to Satan, and apply it to a good cause, for the same reason that Whitfield appropriated several fine tunes from profane music to sacred. He did not think the devil had a right to monopolize good music. We did not think he had an exclusive right to a good sentiment. If a parallel is provoked it will be found that Milton's devils were of the North—not South. Satan's first order was:

"Assemble thou of all those myriads, which we lead the chief! Tell them that by command of thy great King, Her shadowy cloud withdraws, I am to haste, And all who under me their banners wave, Homeward with flying march where we possess The quarters of the North."

"At length into the limits of the North They came and Satan to his royal seat."

And not only was the rebellion a Northern one, but the pretences were similar to those of the North now. It was a "liberty" movement then—a pretence of liberty against slavery.

Thus Satan in reply to Abdiel, says:

"At first I thought that liberty and heaven To heavenly souls had been all one; but now I see that most through sloth had rather serve, Ministring spirits, trained up in feast and song; Such part the angels, the ministrals of heaven Scitully with freedom to contend."

"The Washington Southern Press is awfully distressed at the defeat of the disunionists in Georgia. It says:

With that timidity which is at times the greatest rashness, the majority of the people of Georgia have struck water at the embankment which alone can stay the waves of the flood. If their ears have been closed, if their eyes have been closed, if they have not repaired the breaches they have made, we for the South, for the Union, and the great experiment of self-government—all of which this suicidal act has put in such imminent peril.

Now let it raise your voice, indeed very funny, to hear this fire-and-tow Quaker exclaiming, 'woe for the Union,' because the party in Georgia in favor of preserving the Union has triumphed and the party in favor of immediately dissolving it has been defeated?—*Louisville Journal*.

Not much more funny than to hear a Yankee schoolmaster teaching that the Union can be preserved only by Southern submission to Yankee land and negro-stealing, and finding Southern people stupid enough to believe him.

The editor of the *Washington Union* attempts to excuse General FOOTE for disregarding the sentiment of his constituents, the legislature of Mississippi. Speaking of the letter of the Mississippi delegation, the *Union* says:

"That letter seeks the opinions of the Governor, the legislature, and the people. The two first have expressed theirs: it remains for the latter—the most essential of all—to decide. We presume Gen. Foote is willing to acquiesce in their determination, and if they disapprove of his conduct, whatever may be his own opinions, to submit to their decree without a murmur."

The *Union* and General FOOTE both censured Mr. BENTON for disregarding the instructions of the Missouri legislature, on pretence of appealing to the people. Now the *Union* suggests a similar course for General FOOTE. The editor of the *Union* is rapidly deserting the doctrines of the preservation of the Constitution and Gov-

ernment, to protest against such unlawful State action, come from what quarter it may. Our surprise would have been less, and so would have been our mortification and indignation, had this enactment proceeded from a confessed abolition or "free-soil" source. We hear it said that this law passed almost unopposed through the forms of legislation; and this idea goes some support from the known fact that there has been no manifestation of discontent, no exciting agitation in Vermont on the subject of the Fugitive slave law. But this apology, if true, is a very poor and lame one. Measures of such importance as this, which would so directly and so palpably nullify the Constitution and laws of the United States, would not have been passed without the most serious and deliberate consideration. The members of the legislature would not have been so ready to sanction such a law otherwise than as an directly repugnant to the Constitution and laws of the United States. This act of Vermont plainly and intentionally overrules and sets aside the Constitution and law of Congress. We hold it to be our duty, as persons attached to the preservation of the Constitution and Gov-

For the Southern Press.
New York, 4th Dec. 1850.
I resume the subject of the condition of the English peasantry and operatives, as delineated by the writer quoted in my former letter.
"Last year a mass of evidence was laid before Parliament touching the condition of children employed in factories, which describes a system of torture compared with which the treatment of American slaves appears truly benevolent. When this evidence was published, the whole press of England repeated, day after day, that the worst kind of slavery exists in England. Children of tender years, (babies they would be called in America,) it was shown, are shut up in factories during twelve, fourteen, and sixteen hours every week day, and there compelled to work incessantly, or as hard at least as their slight frames will permit, and for wages which but just satisfy their ruined appetites. The pale cheek, parched lips, swollen stomachs, deformed limbs, and melancholy looks of these little wretches, will be easily imagined. They die off with amazing rapidity; but the places of those who perish are instantly filled, and a frequent change of persons makes no alteration in the scene. Verily, the life of the bulk of the people of England is worse than death."—Page 46.

In the slave States of America, a strong healthy boy or girl is worth £50. In London, on the contrary, of Poor Houses, or roads, or 'strong healthy boys and girls with the usual fee,' not for the usual fee. You do not pay the fee to obtain the boy or girl, but the parish officers pay you for taking one. The usual fee in London is £10, so that in America you pay five times as much as you receive in England. To be sure the boy and girl in London are stronger and healthier; the notice of the London House gives that they are both to invite customers, just as the keepers of gin shops place their windows with 'mountain dew,' and 'cream of the valley.'

"Ah! but," says a respectable Englishman, "the young Americans who cost £50, are born in slavery; the others are free-born English children. The buyer of an American child can do what he likes with it; the English child is merely bound apprentice for a term of years, and the parish pays with each of them an apprentice fee, as a recompense to the master for teaching him his trade. The magistrate is a party to the indentures of apprenticeship; he requires the child's consent; he cancels the bond if the child is ill treated. English children are protected by our glorious and inviolable laws, which makes no difference between rich and poor. It is absurd to compare apprentices with American slaves." I answer, it is the whole press of England, not I, that calls English children white slaves. But not to dispute about words, let us come to facts.

"About three years ago, a woman called Esther Hibner, was hanged in London for beating and starving to death a parish apprentice. In this case, the constitution and law were violated in behalf of the pauper girl—but when? Not before the pauper girl was murdered, but after. Does the law interfere to prevent the murder of apprentices?—this is the question. The evidence in the case of Esther Hibner proved that a number of girls (pauper apprentices) were employed in a workshop; that their virtuous conduct was commonly called 'her wash,' and that of this they never had enough to ward off the pains of hunger; that they were kept half-naked, half clothed in dirty rags; that they slept in a heap on the floor, amid filth and stench; that they suffered dreadfully from cold; that they were forced to work some hours together that they used to fall asleep while at work; that for falling asleep, or for not working as hard as their mistress wished, they were beaten with fists and with sticks, dragged by the hair, dashed to the ground, trampled upon, and otherwise tortured; that they were all found more or less, covered with chilblains, scurvy, bruises, and wounds; that one of them died of ill treatment; and—mark this—that the disciplinary power of the law was made use of to increase the number of codins which had issued from Esther Hibner's premises, and raised the curiosity of her neighbors. For this murder, Esther Hibner was hanged; but what did she get for all the other murders which, referring to the number of codins, we have a right to believe she committed? She got for each £10. That is to say, she was paid for every girl she murdered, dashed, and trampled to death, she got £10 for another girl to treat in the same way, with £10 for her trouble. She carried on a trade in the murder of parish apprentices; and if she had conducted it with moderation, if the profit and custom of murder had not made her grasping and careless, the constitution which protects the weak as well as the rich, would never have interfered with her. The law did not permit her to do what she liked with her apprentices, as the Americans do with their slaves—oh no! These free born English children were merely bound as apprentices, with their own consent, under the eye of a magistrate, in order that they might learn a trade, and become valuable subjects. But did the magistrate, even visit Mr. Hibner's factory, to see how she treated the free born English girls? Never. Did the parish officers? No. Was there any legal provision for the discovery of a woman's trade in murder? None. That woman has not traded in murder for the last three years; but why not? She was hanged three years ago. But what happened here? This is the constitution, or the number of codins? Plainly the number of codins; that is, the impunity, the security, with which she had murdered, the forlorn state of her apprentices, the utter neglect of them by parish officers and magistrates.

"Since Mrs. Hibner was hanged, the inimitable constitution has been altered, but not with respect to the parish apprentices. The 'rules of London poor houses,' 'strong healthy boys and girls, &c.' and boys and girls you may obtain by applying within, as many as you please, all free-born, with the usual fee. Having been paid for taking them, and having gone through the ceremonies of asking their consent, and signing bonds before a magistrate, they are now as the rich, would never have interfered with her. The law did not permit her to do what she liked with her apprentices, as the Americans do with their slaves—oh no! These free born English children were merely bound as apprentices, with their own consent, under the eye of a magistrate, in order that they might learn a trade, and become valuable subjects. But did the magistrate, even visit Mr. Hibner's factory, to see how she treated the free born English girls? Never. Did the parish officers? No. Was there any legal provision for the discovery of a woman's trade in murder? None. That woman has not traded in murder for the last three years; but why not? She was hanged three years ago. But what happened here? This is the constitution, or the number of codins? Plainly the number of codins; that is, the impunity, the security, with which she had murdered, the forlorn state of her apprentices, the utter neglect of them by parish officers and magistrates.

"This commentary on the quotation is trite—second-hand even as applied to us. We thought we could quote a sentiment of fortitude from the speech Milton ascribes to Satan, and apply it to a good cause, for the same reason that Whitfield appropriated several fine tunes from profane music to sacred. He did not think the devil had a right to monopolize good music. We did not think he had an exclusive right to a good sentiment. If a parallel is provoked it will be found that Milton's devils were of the North—not South. Satan's first order was:

"Assemble thou of all those myriads, which we lead the chief! Tell them that by command of thy great King, Her shadowy cloud withdraws, I am to haste, And all who under me their banners wave, Homeward with flying march where we possess The quarters of the North."

"At length into the limits of the North They came and Satan to his royal seat."

And not only was the rebellion a Northern one, but the pretences were similar to those of the North now. It was a "liberty" movement then—a pretence of liberty against slavery.

Thus Satan in reply to Abdiel, says:

"At first I thought that liberty and heaven To heavenly souls had been all one; but now I see that most through sloth had rather serve, Ministring spirits, trained up in feast and song; Such part the angels, the ministrals of heaven Scitully with freedom to contend."

"The Washington Southern Press is awfully distressed at the defeat of the disunionists in Georgia. It says:

With that timidity which is at times the greatest rashness, the majority of the people of Georgia have struck water at the embankment which alone can stay the waves of the flood. If their ears have been closed, if their eyes have been closed, if they have not repaired the breaches they have made, we for the South, for the Union, and the great experiment of self-government—all of which this suicidal act has put in such imminent peril.

Now let it raise your voice, indeed very funny, to hear this fire-and-tow Quaker exclaiming, 'woe for the Union,' because the party in Georgia in favor of preserving the Union has triumphed and the party in favor of immediately dissolving it has been defeated?—*Louisville Journal*.

Not much more funny than to hear a Yankee schoolmaster teaching that the Union can be preserved only by Southern submission to Yankee land and negro-stealing, and finding Southern people stupid enough to believe him.

The editor of the *Washington Union* attempts to excuse General FOOTE for disregarding the sentiment of his constituents, the legislature of Mississippi. Speaking of the letter of the Mississippi delegation, the *Union* says:

"That letter seeks the opinions of the Governor, the legislature, and the people. The two first have expressed theirs: it remains for the latter—the most essential of all—to decide. We presume Gen. Foote is willing to acquiesce in their determination, and if they disapprove of his conduct, whatever may be his own opinions, to submit to their decree without a murmur."

The *Union* and General FOOTE both censured Mr. BENTON for disregarding the instructions of the Missouri legislature, on pretence of appealing to the people. Now the *Union* suggests a similar course for General FOOTE. The editor of the *Union* is rapidly deserting the doctrines of the preservation of the Constitution and Gov-

ernment, to protest against such unlawful State action, come from what quarter it may. Our surprise would have been less, and so would have been our mortification and indignation, had this enactment proceeded from a confessed abolition or "free-soil" source. We hear it said that this law passed almost unopposed through the forms of legislation; and this idea goes some support from the known fact that there has been no manifestation of discontent, no exciting agitation in Vermont on the subject of the Fugitive slave law. But this apology, if true, is a very poor and lame one. Measures of such importance as this, which would so directly and so palpably nullify the Constitution and laws of the United States, would not have been passed without the most serious and deliberate consideration. The members of the legislature would not have been so ready to sanction such a law otherwise than as an directly repugnant to the Constitution and laws of the United States. This act of Vermont plainly and intentionally overrules and sets aside the Constitution and law of Congress. We hold it to be our duty, as persons attached to the preservation of the Constitution and Gov-

For the Southern Press.
New York, 4th Dec. 1850.
I resume the subject of the condition of the English peasantry and operatives, as delineated by the writer quoted in my former letter.
"Last year a mass of evidence was laid before Parliament touching the condition of children employed in factories, which describes a system of torture compared with which the treatment of American slaves appears truly benevolent. When this evidence was published, the whole press of England repeated, day after day, that the worst kind of slavery exists in England. Children of tender years, (babies they would be called in America,) it was shown, are shut up in factories during twelve, fourteen, and sixteen hours every week day, and there compelled to work incessantly, or as hard at least as their slight frames will permit, and for wages which but just satisfy their ruined appetites. The pale cheek, parched lips, swollen stomachs, deformed limbs, and melancholy looks of these little wretches, will be easily imagined. They die off with amazing rapidity; but the places of those who perish are instantly filled, and a frequent change of persons makes no alteration in the scene. Verily, the life of the bulk of the people of England is worse than death."—Page 46.

In the slave States of America, a strong healthy boy or girl is worth £50. In London, on the contrary, of Poor Houses, or roads, or 'strong healthy boys and girls with the usual fee,' not for the usual fee. You do not pay the fee to obtain the boy or girl, but the parish officers pay you for taking one. The usual fee in London is £10, so that in America you pay five times as much as you receive in England. To be sure the boy and girl in London are stronger and healthier; the notice of the London House gives that they are both to invite customers, just as the keepers of gin shops place their windows with 'mountain dew,' and 'cream of the valley.'

"Ah! but," says a respectable Englishman, "the young Americans who cost £50, are born in slavery; the others are free-born English children. The buyer of an American child can do what he likes with it; the English child is merely bound apprentice for a term of years, and the parish pays with each of them an apprentice fee, as a recompense to the master for teaching him his trade. The magistrate is a party to the indentures of apprenticeship; he requires the child's consent; he cancels the bond if the child is ill treated. English children are protected by our glorious and inviolable laws, which makes no difference between rich and poor. It is absurd to compare apprentices with American slaves." I answer, it is the whole press of England, not I, that calls English children white slaves. But not to dispute about words, let us come to facts.

"About three years ago, a woman called Esther Hibner, was hanged in London for beating and starving to death a parish apprentice. In this case, the constitution and law were violated in behalf of the pauper girl—but when? Not before the pauper girl was murdered, but after. Does the law interfere to prevent the murder of apprentices?—this is the question. The evidence in the case of Esther Hibner proved that a number of girls (pauper apprentices) were employed in a workshop; that their virtuous conduct was commonly called 'her wash,' and that of this they never had enough to ward off the pains of hunger; that they were kept half-naked, half clothed in dirty rags; that they slept in a heap on the floor, amid filth and stench; that they suffered dreadfully from cold; that they were forced to work some hours together that they used to fall asleep while at work; that for falling asleep, or for not working as hard as their mistress wished, they were beaten with fists and with sticks, dragged by the hair, dashed to the ground, trampled upon, and otherwise tortured; that they were all found more or less, covered with chilblains, scurvy, bruises, and wounds; that one of them died of ill treatment; and—mark this—that the disciplinary power of the law was made use of to increase the number of codins which had issued from Esther Hibner's premises, and raised the curiosity of her neighbors. For this murder, Esther Hibner was hanged; but what did she get for all the other murders which, referring to the number of codins, we have a right to believe she committed? She got for each £10. That is to say, she was paid for every girl she murdered, dashed, and trampled to death, she got £10 for another girl to treat in the same way, with £10 for her trouble. She carried on a trade in the murder of parish apprentices; and if she had conducted it with moderation, if the profit and custom of murder had not made her grasping and careless, the constitution which protects the weak as well as the rich, would never have interfered with her. The law did not permit her to do what she liked with her apprentices, as the Americans do with their slaves—oh no! These free born English children were merely bound as apprentices, with their own consent, under the eye of a magistrate, in order that they might learn a trade, and become valuable subjects. But did the magistrate, even visit Mr. Hibner's factory, to see how she treated the free born English girls? Never. Did the parish officers? No. Was there any legal provision for the discovery of a woman's trade in murder? None. That woman has not traded in murder for the last three years; but why not? She was hanged three years ago. But what happened here? This is the constitution, or the number of codins? Plainly the number of codins; that is, the impunity, the security, with which she had murdered, the forlorn state of her apprentices, the utter neglect of them by parish officers and magistrates.

"Since Mrs. Hibner was hanged, the inimitable constitution has been altered, but not with respect to the parish apprentices. The 'rules of London poor houses,' 'strong healthy boys and girls, &c.' and boys and girls you may obtain by applying within, as many as you please, all free-born, with the usual fee. Having been paid for taking them, and having gone through the ceremonies of asking their consent, and signing bonds before a magistrate, they are now as the rich, would never have interfered with her. The law did not permit her to do what she liked with her apprentices, as the Americans do with their slaves—oh no! These free born English children were merely bound as apprentices, with their own consent, under the eye of a magistrate, in order that they might learn a trade, and become valuable subjects. But did the magistrate, even visit Mr. Hibner's factory, to see how she treated the free born English girls? Never. Did the parish officers? No. Was there any legal provision for the discovery of a woman's trade in murder? None. That woman has not traded in murder for the last three years; but why not? She was hanged three years ago. But what happened here? This is the constitution, or the number of codins? Plainly the number of codins; that is, the impunity, the security, with which she had murdered, the forlorn state of her apprentices, the utter neglect of them by parish officers and magistrates.

"This commentary on the quotation is trite—second-hand even as applied to us. We thought we could quote a sentiment of fortitude from the speech Milton ascribes to Satan, and apply it to a good cause, for the same reason that Whitfield appropriated several fine tunes from profane music to sacred. He did not think the devil had a right to monopolize good music. We did not think he had an exclusive right to a good sentiment. If a parallel is provoked it will be found that Milton's devils were of the North—not South. Satan's first order was:

"Assemble thou of all those myriads, which we lead the chief! Tell them that by command of thy great King, Her shadowy cloud withdraws, I am to haste, And all who under me their banners wave, Homeward with flying march where we possess The quarters of the North."

"At length into the limits of the North They came and Satan to his royal seat."

And not only was the rebellion a Northern one, but the pretences were similar to those of the North now. It was a "liberty" movement then—a pretence of liberty against slavery.

Thus Satan in reply to Abdiel, says:

"At first I thought that liberty and heaven To heavenly souls had been all one; but now I see that most through sloth had rather serve, Ministring spirits, trained up in feast and song; Such part the angels, the ministrals of heaven Scitully with freedom to contend."

"The Washington Southern Press is awfully distressed at the defeat of the disunionists in Georgia. It says:

With that timidity which is at times the greatest rashness, the majority of the people of Georgia have struck water at the embankment which alone can stay the waves of the flood. If their ears have been closed, if their eyes have been closed, if they have not repaired the breaches they have made, we for the South, for the Union, and the great experiment of self-government—all of which this suicidal act has put in such imminent peril.

Now let it raise your voice, indeed very funny, to hear this fire-and-tow Quaker exclaiming, 'woe for the Union,' because the party in Georgia in favor of preserving the Union has triumphed and the party in favor of immediately dissolving it has been defeated?—*Louisville Journal*.

Not much more funny than to hear a Yankee schoolmaster teaching that the Union can be preserved only by Southern submission to Yankee land and negro-stealing, and finding Southern people stupid enough to believe him.

The editor of the *Washington Union* attempts to excuse General FOOTE for disregarding the sentiment of his constituents, the legislature of Mississippi. Speaking of the letter of the Mississippi delegation, the *Union* says:

"That letter seeks the opinions of the Governor, the legislature, and the people. The two first have expressed theirs: it remains for the latter—the most essential of all—to decide. We presume Gen. Foote is willing to acquiesce in their determination, and if they disapprove of his conduct, whatever may be his own opinions, to submit to their decree without a murmur."

The *Union* and General FOOTE both censured Mr. BENTON for disregarding the instructions of the Missouri legislature, on pretence of appealing to the people. Now the *Union* suggests a similar course for General FOOTE. The editor of the *Union* is rapidly deserting the doctrines of the preservation of the Constitution and Gov-

ernment, to protest against such unlawful State action, come from what quarter it may. Our surprise would have been less, and so would have been our mortification and indignation, had this enactment proceeded from a confessed abolition or "free-soil" source. We hear it said that this law passed almost unopposed through the forms of legislation; and this idea goes some support from the known fact that there has been no manifestation of discontent, no exciting agitation in Vermont on the subject of the Fugitive slave law. But this apology, if true, is a very poor and lame one. Measures of such importance as this, which would so directly and so palpably nullify the Constitution and laws of the United States, would not have been passed without the most serious and deliberate consideration. The members of the legislature would not have been so ready to sanction such a law otherwise than as an directly repugnant to the Constitution and laws of the United States. This act of Vermont plainly and intentionally overrules and sets aside the Constitution and law of Congress. We hold it to be our duty, as persons attached to the preservation of the Constitution and Gov-

ernment, to protest against such unlawful State action, come from what quarter it may. Our surprise would have been less, and so would have been our mortification and indignation, had this enactment proceeded from a confessed abolition or "free-soil" source. We hear it said that this law passed almost unopposed through the forms of legislation; and this idea goes some support from the known fact that there has been no manifestation of discontent, no exciting agitation in Vermont on the subject of the Fugitive slave law. But this apology, if true, is a very poor and lame one. Measures of such importance as this, which would so directly and so palpably nullify the Constitution and laws of the United States, would not have been passed without the most serious and deliberate consideration. The members of the legislature would not have been so ready to sanction such a law otherwise than as an directly repugnant to the Constitution and laws of the United States. This act of Vermont plainly and intentionally overrules and sets aside the Constitution and law of Congress. We hold it to be our duty, as persons attached to the preservation of the Constitution and Gov-

For the Southern Press.
New York, 4th Dec. 1850.
I resume the subject of the condition of the English peasantry and operatives, as delineated by the writer quoted in my former letter.
"Last year a mass of evidence was laid before Parliament touching the condition of children employed in factories, which describes a system of torture compared with which the treatment of American slaves appears truly benevolent. When this evidence was published, the whole press of England repeated, day after day, that the worst kind of slavery exists in England. Children of tender years, (babies they would be called in America,) it was shown, are shut up in factories during twelve, fourteen, and sixteen hours every week day, and there compelled to work incessantly, or as hard at least as their slight frames will permit, and for wages which but just satisfy their ruined appetites. The pale cheek, parched lips, swollen stomachs, deformed limbs, and melancholy looks of these little wretches, will be easily imagined. They die off with amazing rapidity; but the places of those who perish are instantly filled, and a frequent change of persons makes no